



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,393	11/21/2003	Alexei V. Galatenko	03-0937/L13.12-0257	2571
7590	12/13/2005			
Leo Peters LSI Logic Corporation MS D-106 1621 Barber Lane Milpitas, CA 95035			EXAMINER DOAN, NGHIA M	
			ART UNIT 2825	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/719,393

Applicant(s)

GALATENKO ET AL.

Examiner

Nghia M. Doan

Art Unit

2825

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: 2-10 and 12-20.
Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 11.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 10/27/2005
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the claim rejections of claims 2-10 and 12-20 by Andreev et al. and Hossain et al...

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's Argument filed on 11/07/2005 pages 1-4, with respect to Andreev's reference has been fully considered and its not persuasive for the independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, the rejection over Andreev's reference on the last office is maintained.

As to claims 1 and 11: Andreev does disclose a process and computer program that places cells particularly megacells (page 1, paragraph 14)

As to claims 1 and 11: Andreev does disclose the limitation of "inflating a size of at least some of the megacells" (as figure 5, step 84, page 3, paragraph 35, describes that "step 84 the cell/custer (megacell) coordinates of each rectangle R3 and R4 is adjusted (inflated) based on the values of rectangle edge a and b) and adjusting may indicate increasing or decreasing a size;

As to claims 1 and 11: Andreev does disclose the limitation of " placing the megacell in a footprint of the circuit to reduce placement complexity", (page 1, paragraph 15, recites that " the chip has a rectangular configuration and contains blockage, which are rectangular fragments of the chip where cells may not be placed. The area of chip that is not covered by any blockage or a fixed cell is referred to as a free area (footprint), and is available for cell placement). In addition, "to reduce placement complexity" is a result of placement process.

As to claims 1 and 11: Andreev does disclose the limitation of "permuting megacell placement to reduce place complexity" (figure 4, page 2, paragraph 29, recites that "executes movement of the cell and cluster, but does not change the relative position of the cell and cluster. If a cell/ cluster is give side of another cell/cluster before apply the process, that same relative position is retained on execution of the process). As described in this section, "movement of the cell and cluster" reads on the limitation "permuting megacell placement"; and the other recitations, such as " does not change the relative position of the cell and cluster" and "relative position is retained" read on "to reduce the complexity".

Andreev's reference discloses all the limitations of claims 1 and 11. Therefore, the rejection over Andrew's reference for the independent claims 1 and 11 is maintained.

Applicant's Argument filed on 11/07/2005 pages 4-5, with respect to the dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 has been fully considered and its persuasive. Therefore, the rejection of the dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 on the last office have been withdrawn.

As to Hossain's reference, Applicant's Argument filed on 11/07/2005 pages 5-8, with respect to Hossain's reference has been fully consideration and persuasive. Therefore, the rejection over Hossain's reference on the last office have been withdrawn. .

A. M. Thompson
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800

